

**From:** "DuVall, Angie" <aduvall@usfarathane.com>  
**To:** "MCSF@courts.mi.gov" <MCSF@courts.mi.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, May 16, 2003 11:49 AM  
**Subject:** Comment for ADM 2003-22-10

Dear Friend of Court,

My comment is for ADM 2003-22-10 Shared Economic.

I believe there should be other ways to determine Shared Economic Support. 52 days a year, is way too high to start cutting cost. I am a parent of two children. I was on SER and it was terrible for both me and the children.

When you're on SER, we were told everything would be split 50/50.

Well, my support was all of \$26,000 per child a week, and I was told that we would share equally in all other expenses. Well, I ended up paying for all their expenses. It took months before I was able to present documents to have this go onto his arrearages. Is that fair?

Does anyone really look at the cost of Expenses for their food every day, water & heating for their daily baths, extra expense of rent for 2 bedroom versus one, school expenses, field trips & supplies, clothes, daycare, after school activities, medical cost (Since my employee offered it at a lower rate than his.) or monthly co-pays & prescriptions.

Sure, you could turn in some of these expenses to the courts, but then who has the time and money to take off work to go and fight for them. And it puts more burden on the courts to prepare for this order that would never be, if child support wasn't set at SER.

Also, when the responsible parent works, who has the time needed to write and document all this. Then once this is done? If you're lucky, you end up with it being applied to their arrearage account, but then it will be take several years to pay it off.

Would Michigan not be acceptable to the burden of this debt to the paying parent because of such a high decrease in child support? For example, in Wisconsin, the rate for one child is 17%. They decided against lowering SER because of the fact that the courts would be burdened with the cost of custodial parent applying for aid because of the lack of money now being received.

In my case, when I was on SER (2000), that first year, he never paid a dime. Then he left Michigan and he chose not to have any contact with his children for the last two years. His support stayed at \$26.00 per child until I went back and was granted more support and full support. Now, my ex-husband has returned. It's been over two years (with 6 months being back in MI, 50 minutes away) and he still has not seen his children. Well, it wasn't until last week, he called, and said that he wanted to see his children again. I wondered why that is. Why now? Well, upon speaking with him, he had seen on the news that the courts were changing all their programs and he stated that he wanted to go back on shared economic responsibility. He heard it was going to cut his support in half, if he was

able to have the children for 52 days per year. What a reason to see your children for.

So for people to say, its way they pay to much, they don't realize what it actually takes to raise children properly. So is it really for the children, or for the parent that wants to get out of their responsibilities? Should the children have to suffer just because one parent doesn't want to live up their responsibility?

I feel, If you modify SER to 52 days, the courts will become burden with the complaints, modification orders, documentation's of receipts for all SER to each parent, etc. It will be a great mis-justice to the responsible parties involved. I know more than likely, most paying parents are for this, and most non-paying parents are against this. What was wrong with leaving it as it is, and leaving the deviating in their for long lengths of time the paying parent shares in. Children should not suffer or miss out just because one parent lacks on their responsibility. I think going down to 52 days is way, way to steep.

Sincerely,  
Angela DuVall

CC: "duvall348@cs.com" <duvall348@cs.com>